

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY
SENATE - May 12, 1967

The University Senate met at 2:10 p.m., May 12, 1967, Professor Wood, Chairman of the Executive Committee presiding in the absence of President Elliott, and the temporary absence of Vice President Bright.

The minutes of the previous meeting were amended as follows: Paragraph 4, page 1, line 7, delete the words "and Brewer" and insert the following after the words "target dates" on line 9:

"Professor Brewer expressed his strong approval, in principle, of the action of the committee in taking up the problem which he felt was one of great concern to the faculty: he favored further study, but urged careful consideration of conflicting commitments of the faculty in early September (for example, the American Political Science members normally have their annual meeting immediately after Labor Day," - - -

The minutes were then approved as distributed, with the above amendment.

The nominees of the Executive Committee for membership on the various committees for the 1967/68 Session (see attached I) were unanimously elected. The ex-officio members of these committees will be indicated when they are appointed by President Elliott.

The Annual Report of the Library Committee (with attached Resolution #66/22) (Attachment II, as amended) was presented by Professor Clubb, Chairman. Professor Arkilic, seconded by Professor Stevens, proposed an amendment to the last paragraph of the resolution: strike the words "within a minimum of three to five years" and insert the words "in the shortest possible time." The amendment then was voted upon and carried. After general discussion of the report and the amended resolution, the resolution was voted upon in separate paragraphs of the resolving clause and carried in each instance.

Professor Reesing, on behalf of the University Objectives Committee presented its report (without Resolution #66/17 previously proposed, but subsequently withdrawn) and discussed some of the matters covered in the report. Professor Reesing hoped the Senate would continue to examine closely other phases of TECHNOLOGY AND THE MODERN UNIVERSITY in its committees during the coming session.

Professor Parlett, on behalf of the Research Committee, presented its annual report without resolutions, and urged an early definition of the purposes and goals of this Committee, stating that considerable confusion existed within the Committee as to its objectives.

On motion made by Professor Stromsen, seconded by Professor Arkilic and carried, Item #7 on the agenda was then considered. After reading the resolution passed by the School of Government and Business Administration at its faculty meeting on March 29, 1967, Professor Stromsen moved Resolution 66/21 (see attached III) seconded by Professor Lewis. After general discussion of this Resolution as to whether or not such decanal titles are necessary when the primary responsibility of the incumbent is teaching; whether or not chairmen of departments might also be placed in such categories at a later time; whether or not the

independence of faculty members would be curtailed by the presence of administrative personnel; or the independence of administrative personnel while members of the Senate would be impaired by divided loyalties in discussions; whether or not the Faculty Organization should be "tinkered with" too often, and lose its original strength, Professor Weston moved, seconded by Professor Stevens, that Resolution #66/21 be tabled and the motion carried. Professor Stromsen then proposed another resolution to add to Resolution #66/8, paragraph 3 of the resolving clause, on line 9, after the word "election" the phrase "but this provision shall not affect any incumbent elected member during his current term in the Senate, who is otherwise duly qualified." After general discussion of this proposal, and reassurances that such a proposition is inherent in the wording of Resolution #66/8, this motion was withdrawn.

Professor Wood, Chairman of the Executive Committee, then rose to welcome the new members of the Senate, and the new Editor of the Hatchet, Mr. Berl Brechner (who was an invited guest of the Senate), and thanked the retiring members of the Senate for their enthusiastic support of the Senate and its committees during the past session, especially Professor Weston, who had contributed outstandingly as a member of the Executive Committee during the first year of his term, and as Chairman of the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom during the second half of his term.

The Chairman proposed a special citation (see attached V) for distinguished service to Professor Charles R. Naeser who has continuously served as a member of the Senate and Chairman of its committee on Faculty Performance and Development from its inception through the 1966/67 Session, and asked unanimous consent to act on a resolution concerning the citation. Consent was granted by acclamation and the resolution was unanimously carried.

Professor Wood then presented the Report of the Executive Committee and reviewed some developments of the year with which the Senate had been involved. He cited 1) the progress made in the development of the College of General Studies into a division more closely related to the rest of the University, 2) the improvements which are in progress or for which definite commitments have been undertaken in the physical plant. He mentioned particularly the needs and plans for the library. 3) the improvement in faculty salaries and the plans for reaching the AAUP "A" level by the year 1970-71, 4) the improvement in faculty-student relationships, 5) the involvement of the University Senate in such matters as proposed calendar changes, and 6) the strengthening of the place of the University Senate in the over-all life of the University. Professor Wood looked forward to closer relations of students, administration, and faculty in committees of the University Senate and proposed that committees should always be receptive to communications from students and that the committees might well consider holding open meetings from time to time.

Professor Weston, seconded by Professor Wood, proposed a Resolution of Appreciation to Professor Park (see attached 66/23) for his outstanding service as Parliamentarian of the Senate. Consent was given and the resolution was passed unanimously.

Professor Naeser rose to thank the Senate for its citation and addressed a few words to the members and the committees urging their serious involvement in the Senate as the elected representatives of the faculty in the life of The George Washington University.

A special meeting of the Senate was then called for May 26, 1967 to debate proposed calendar changes.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Frederick R. Houser
Secretary

MEMBERS OF SENATE COMMITTEES FOR
THE 1967-68 SESSION

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Reuben E. Wood, Chairman, CC, Chemistry
Richard C. Allen, Law, Schl of
Galip M. Arkilic, Engr., Schl of
Seymour Alpert, Anest., M.S.
Robert C. Willson, Journ. CC

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS AS THEY AFFECT
THE FACULTY

* David J. Sharpe, Law, Chairman, LS
Gayle Clapp, Phys Educ, CC
Robert E. Cronin, Engr, SEAS
Frederick H. Gibbs, Hosp. Admin. CC
William F. Long, Econ, SGBA
Margaret McIntyre, Educ, Schl of
Harry Page, Bus. Admin, SGBA
Robert Moore, Engl Comp, CC
Hiram M. Stout, Intl Affrs, SPIA

ADMISSIONS AND ADVANCED STANDING

*Edward H. Braun, Engr., Chairman, SEAS
Victor Cohn, Pharm., M.S.
Arthur D. Kirsch, Stat., CC
Frederick L. Minn, Chem., CC
Margaret Montzka, Phy., CC
Charles B. Reed, Phys.Educ., CC
Waldo Sommers, Pub. Admin, SGBA

APPOINTMENT, SALARY AND PROMOTION POLICIES

*Robert C. Willson, Journ., Chairman, CC
Burton Epstein, Anest., M.S.
Raymond Fox, Engr., SEAS
Margaret Kiley, Educ., Schl of
N. David Nelson, Math., CC
*Richard H. Schlagel, Phil., CC
Klaus Thoenelt, Germ., CC

ATHLETICS

*Carl Stromsen, Pub.Admin., Chairman, SGBA
Donna Abbey, Phys. Educ. CC
John Cantini, Asst.V.P., Asst. Treas.
Edward A. Caress, Chem., CC
J. Forrester Davison, Law, Schl of
*Raymond G. Hanken, Phys. Educ., CC
Frederick R. Houser, Registrar
Howard C. Pierpont, Surgery, M.S.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY

* Artley J. Zuchelli, Phys., Chairman
Avery Andrews, Hist., CC
John W. Brewer, Intl Law, CC
John B. Christensen, Anat., M.S.
Paul A. Crafton, Engr., SEAS
Thomas F. Courtless, Law, Schl of
William B. Griffith, Phil, CC
William McDonald, Art, CC
Joseph Metivier, Rom. Lang., CC
Ruth I. Peterson, Educ., Schl of

FACULTY PERFORMANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

* Richard C. Allen, Law, Chairman
Patrick F. Gallagher, Anthro, CC
George F. Henigan, Speech, CC
Rudolph Hugh, Microbiol., M.S.
Charles R. Naeser, Chem., CC
Howard M. Sachar, Hist., CC
Theodore E. Toridis, Engr., SEAS

LIBRARY

*Thomas P. Liverman, Math., Chairman, CC
James H. Coberly, Amer. Lit., CC
John H. Frey, Rom. Lang., CC
Francis J. Hughes, Engr., SEAS
Laurence P. Leite, Art, CC
Bernard Levy, Psych., CC
Mary Louise Robbins, Microbiol, M.S.
Samuel Wrenn, Chem., CC

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

*Theodore Perros, Chem., Chairman
Perry Botwin, Spec. Educ., Schl of
Nicholae Filipescu, Chem., CC
David C. Green, Law, Schl of
Angus McI. Griffin, Microbiol., M.S.
Julian Kulski, Pub.Admin., SGBA

PROFESSIONAL ETHICS AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

* Robert E. Park, Law, Chairman
Robert S. Barter, Obstet & Gyn, M.S.
Paul A. Crafton, Engr., SEAS
Roderic H. Davison, Hist., CC
Wood Gray, Hist., CC
James Mosel, Psych., CC
Glen E. Weston, Law, Schl of

PUBLIC CEREMONIES

* John G. Boswell, Educ., Chairman
Paul Calabrisi, Anat., M.S.
Vincent DeAngelis, Educ., Schl of
Roy Eastin, Govt. & Bus. Admin., SGBA
Robert Honeygosky, Speech, CC
Elizabeth Tidball, Physiol., M.S.
Harry E. Yeide, Jr., Rel., CC

RESEARCH

* Norman C. Kramer, Med., Chairman M.S.
Arthur E. Burns, Econ, GSAS
Alton H. Desmond, Zool. CC
* Robert Heller, Engr., SEAS
James Hillis, Speech, CC
Herman H. Hobbs, Phys., CC
George A. Olkhovsky, Russian, CC
* Robert C. Parlett, Microbiol. M.S.
Ira R. Telford, Anat., M.S.
Benjamin Van Evera, Chem., CC

SCHOLARSHIP

* Carol R. St. Cyr, Educ., Chairman
Guido Mazzeo, Romance Lang., CC
Frank N. Miller, Pathology, M.S.
Edward A. Potts, Law, Schl of
William L. Turner, Engl., CC
James C. Dockeray, Finance, Dean SGBA

STUDENT RELATIONSHIPS

*Robert W. Kenny, Hist., Chairman, CC
Lillian Hamilton, Art, CC
*Peter P. Hill, Hist., CC
Robert G. Jones, Rel., CC
George M. Koehl, Physics, CC
Steven J. Korcheck, Phys. Ed., CC
John A. Morgan, Jr., Pol. Sci, CC
Robert M. Riggs, Rom. Lang., CC
Nan B. Smith, Phys. Ed. CC
Paul S. Weisberg, Psychiatry, M.S.
Helen Yakobson, Slavic Lang., CC

UNIVERSITY RESOURCES

*Edwin J. B. Lewis, Acctg., SGBA, CC
Thomas McP. Brown, Med., M.S.
John T. Dailey, Educ., Schl of
Calvin T. Klopp, Surg., M.S.
George McSpadden, Rom. Lang., CC
Geza Teleki, Geol., CC
Clifford T. Ireland, Statistics, CC.

UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVES

* John P. Reesing, Engl. Chairman CC
Frank D. Allan, Anat., M.S.
Louis dePian, Engr., SEAS
Richard Ericson, Bus. Admin., SGBA CC
Harold Green, Law, Schl of
Robert W. Prouty, Spec.Educ., Schl of
David E. Silber, Psych., CC
Richard Stephens, Sociology, CC

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
May 12, 1967

The term of membership in the University Senate is only two years and there are frequent changes in the roster, particularly at the end of each session. The Senate is a continuing body, however, and it seems appropriate that this report of the Executive Committee which served during the 1966-67 session should not only account in outline for its activities and those of the Senate and its other committees during that session but should add some context to these activities by looking behind and ahead of this period. Attached to this report is a tabulation of the resolutions introduced during the 1966-67 session with a statement of the action on each. Comments on some of these will be woven into later actions of this report.

Among the most controversial although perhaps not among the most important decisions of the 1966-67 academic year at The George Washington University was that to terminate subsidized intercollegiate football. In its 1964-65 session, the University Senate passed a resolution urging this action. The fact that the Senate's recommendation was initially rejected by the Board of Trustees and that it was only after Lloyd Elliott became president of the University, and with his sponsorship, that the recommended action was taken by the Board, illustrates the futility of trying to claim measures of credit or to ascribe measures of blame for decisions in which many have pleaded pro or con. It may be that the recommendation of the University Senate had little influence in this matter. A more plausible interpretation would be that the Senate's resolution appreciably strengthened the hand of President Elliott. During the past year there has been progress in other matters with which the Senate has been concerned over a period of years and with regard to which it and its committees have made recommendations. Surely worthy of mention would be the following:

1. Progress has been made in the development of the College of General Studies into a division more closely related to the rest of the University. CGS has long been of concern to the Senate and it was designated as an operation for particular examination by the Middle States' evaluation team. Adoption of the policy to return degree-granting functions from CGS to the other divisions of the University is a notable mark of this progress.
2. The physical facilities of the University are of perennial concern to the Senate. Although there has inevitably been some disagreement on details, and there is in the report of the Senate's Physical Facilities Committee a complaint about the accessibility to it of timely and adequate information about plans, it is evident not only that some buildings are rising but that the Board of Trustees has firmly committed itself to a development program of the order of one hundred million dollars, a large fraction of which is for physical facilities.
3. Outstanding among the inadequacies of the facilities of the University which have concerned the Senate and with respect to which it and its committee have made recommendations is the library. This, too, was a weakness selected for especial criticism by the Middle States Commission. Yet one can cite as good signs of progress the appointment of an able new librarian, the current and projected increases in the budget of the library and the general acknowledgment that improvement of the library is very high on the list of the very-high-priority projects of the University.

4. Faculty salaries have improved. We note with satisfaction the adoption by the administration of the goal of raising average salaries in each rank to the AAUP "A" level by the year 1970-71. Some question remains, however, about achieving this goal. When one considers the first and second derivatives - the rate of increase, and the rate of increase of the rate of increase - based on the salary levels announced for 1966-67 and for 1967-68, and compares these with the projected increase in the AAUP scales, it is not clear that we are likely to catch up in all ranks. We salute the progress and, in Tom Lehrer's academese, urge the administration to "fight fiercely" to the goal.

In commenting on the state of relations among faculty, students, administration and trustees we would not, in the words of the pharisee, thank God that we are not as other men. Yet we can observe with gratitude that some of the afflictions suffered by sister institutions have not yet, at least, been visited upon us. Good faculty and student morale was a finding that impressed the Middle States evaluators. Credit for this mutual good will is doubtless due to students, trustees, administrators and faculty members who have studied their own problems and aspirations in the framework of the University as a whole and with an underlying commitment to its welfare.

During the past year the Senate has acted favorably on three resolutions directly affecting students. These were (a) a resolution authorizing the Chairman of the Executive Committee to invite student and other observers to attend Senate meetings, (b) a resolution adding student members to the Committee on Athletics of the Senate, and (c) a resolution making it possible under specified circumstances for student observers and others to make statements on the Senate floor. In the preceding session the Senate had passed a resolution making it possible for students and other nonfaculty members of the University community to be elected to membership on Senate committees and had elected student members to the Committee on Student Relations.

The Chairman of the Executive Committee recently attended the initial "happening" of the so-called Free University at The George Washington University. In part it was an open forum for the airing of complaints and for suggestions of aspects of the operation of the University in need of reform. The comments of many of the students were impressive for their sincerity and fair-mindedness. One student's remarks are memorable. He said that the students were not seeking to run the University, were not asking voting membership on all its boards and committees, but that they were acutely in need of an effective mechanism through which they would be heard in the places where decisions are made. This would seem to us a most constructive position, a request that every means should be used to grant. As an important contribution to the establishment of such a mechanism, we believe that every committee of the University Senate including the Executive Committee should be made easily accessible to students. The information that these committees are always receptive to communications from students and student organizations should be actively disseminated among them. At the discretion of the committees students should be invited to appear personally before the committees. In fact it might be advantageous for committees from time to time to have open meetings.

Resolution 66/11 which makes it possible in the period immediately preceding the adjournment of meetings for nonmembers of the Senate to make statements on the floor is worthy of further comment. This could be an important rule. The effectiveness of any representative body depends in large measure on the support of its constituents and the interest of the community which it serves. Despite the demanding preoccupations of the faculty it is somewhat disappointing that more members of the faculty do not attend Senate meetings. It can be hoped that the possibility for a faculty member

to bring a problem or express a point of view directly and in person to the University Senate will lessen the detachment and disinterest, the out-groupness, felt toward the Senate by some members of the faculty.

The closest and most active relationship between the Senate and large numbers of members of the faculty and the administration is established through the committees of the Senate. At present the standing committees include a total of about 130 members. The number of faculty members offering or requesting service on committees exceeds this number substantially. It is a very difficult task for the Executive Committee to pick out sets of nominees for these committees. We are working on the project of getting some help from the computer. The factors which should be balanced against each other are chiefly the advantages of (1) continuity, (2) change, (3) willingness to serve, (4) special competence, and (5) distribution of membership among the various departments and divisions of the University.

The size of committees has been intentionally increased during recent years. Some of the advantages of this increase are suggested by the foregoing list of factors to be taken into account in membership selection. Also, however, both as a reason for and as a consequence of the increase in size, the establishment of more sub-committees would seem to be desirable. The possibility of elimination of the considerable duplication of effort now represented by the parallel existence of Senate committees and University committees is still under active consideration. If, for example, it should seem in the interests of efficiency for the Senate to assume responsibility in the areas of student publications or the performing arts, under the present standing committee structure the logical instruments would be sub-committees of the Student Relations Committee.

A number of facts support our belief that under the administration of President Elliott, the University Senate has gained stature and will become an increasingly important organ of the University. The Chairman of the Executive Committee has been made a member of the Administrative Policy and the Academic Policy Committees of the University and of the Advisory Board of the Program of Policy Studies. The Executive Committee has been consulted in numerous important matters including the appointments of deans and vice-presidents and the question of terminating subsidized intercollegiate football. The Chairman of the Executive Committee was asked to serve as one of the two representatives of The George Washington University on The George Washington-Temple-Pace College evaluation team of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

At the last meeting of the Executive Committee the President made it clear that whatever recommendation the Senate might make regarding proposed changes in the academic calendar he would construe as about as close to a mandate as he could recognize without abdicating the primary responsibility delegated to him by the Board of Trustees. In itself this statement would be of limited importance. But it seems probable that such delegations of de facto authority will be extended to other areas of concern to the Senate. One of the implications of this probability is that committees of the Senate must undertake some supervisory functions. It is unlikely that they will do a good job of recommending policy if they remain aloof from the specific problems that arise with respect to the carrying out of these policies. From time to time some committees have acted with a degree of autonomy. We do not believe that this kind of initiative should be squelched. Rather, we believe that the Senate should lay down whatever broad policies it sees fit and should prescribe the range of responsibility of the various committees. But within their areas of competence, in accord with adopted general policy and subject to review or intervention by the Senate, the committees should be encouraged to undertake and carry out any assignments given them by the Senate on its own behalf or at the request of

the administration.

The Senate and many of its committees make heavy demands on their members. We must constantly seek to use such service more efficiently. But an appreciable contribution of time and effort without immediate tangible compensation can probably not be avoided if the faculty is to attain and maintain its proper place in the functioning of the University.

Members of the Executive Committee

Seymour Alpert*
David Sharpe
Carol St. Cyr
Edwin Stevens
Reuben Wood, Chairman
Lloyd Elliott, ex officio

*Professor Alpert was out of the city during the period of preparation of this report and did not read it before it was issued.

University Senate
Resolutions 1966/67 Session

<u>Number</u>	<u>Date of Meeting</u>	<u>Title of Resolution</u>	<u>Disposition</u> <u>Passed</u> <u>Rej.</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
66/1	5/13/66	A Resolution Commending the Administration on its actions during 1965/66 to Improve the Physical Facilities of the University	Unan. Passed	Presented by Phys. Fac. Com. (attchd to Annual Report 65/66)
66/2		A Resolution to Enable the University Senate to Enlarge the Eligibility for Standing Committee Membership	Unan. Passed	Presented by Exec. Com. for forwarding thru Fac. Assembly
		/Approved by Board of Trustees 10/20/66	Voted upon in two parts, Part 1 (Par 1, 2, 3) & Part II (Par. 4 & 5)	
66/3		A Resolution to Provide Senate Representation for the SGBA and SPIA	Passed	Orig motion presented by Exec. Com. Amendment by SGBA defeated.
66/4		A Resolution of Commendation and Appreciation to the Enosinian Debate Society of The George Washington U.	Unan Passed	
66/5		A Resolution of Appreciation and Farewell to V.P. & Dean of Faculties John A. Brown, Jr.	Unan. Passed	With standing ovation
66/6		A Resolution of Appreciation to Prof. Edwin L. Stevens (retiring chrmn of the Executive Committee)	Unan. Passed	
66/7	10/14/66	A Resolution to Define Eligibility for Elective Membership in the University Senate	Retd to Exec. Com.	For further study Weston/Naeser motion.
66/8	11/4/66	A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Org. Plan to Define Eligibility for membership in University Senate	Passed	After several suggested amendments, Resolution passed as presented
66/9	12/9/66	A Resolution to Invite the President of the Student Council to attend meetings of University Senate. (Presented by Stud. Rel. Com.)		Withdrawn in favor of substitute motion.
66/9	Substitute Motion	A Resolution to Empower the Chairman of the Exec. Com. specified discretion to invite observers to attend meetings of Senate. (Presented by Executive Committee)		Passed 14-6 as amended.
66/10		A Resolution regarding the new Graduate School of Arts and Sciences	Passed	Presented by Educ. Pol. Com. by suspension of rules of order.
66/11	1/13/67	A Resolution to Amend the Provisional By-Laws of the University Senate to Provide for Statements and Discussions.	Unan. Passed	Presented by Exec Com thru Chairman of By-Laws Com.
		A Resolution to Provide for Student Membership on the Senate Athletics Com.	Passed as Amended	Presented by Athletics Committee

Number	Date of Mtg.	Title of Resolution	Disposition		Remarks
			Psd.	Rej.	
66/13	3/10/67	A Resolution to Establish a Committee Withdrawn in on Honors of the Univ. Senate.		favor of 13(a)	by Publ Cere Committee
66/13A	(substitute motion)	A Resolution to Facilitate the University Senate's nomina- tion of candidates for Honorary degrees		Unan. Passed	"
66/14		Resolution on the SEAS Evaluation Report by the Committee on Professional Ethics & Acad Freedom		Unan. Passed.	Presented as Attch ment to Spec.Rept. of Committee
66/15		A Resolution for Inclusion of a Theater in Univ. Center		Unan. Passed	Presented by Stud. Rel.Com. by suspen- sion of rules of order
66/16	4/14/67	Proposed Resolution on Educ.Pol. concerning Academic Inter-Action Within the University.		Unan Passed	Presented by Educ Pol Com. with annual report.
66/17		(This Resolution was Withdrawn by Univ. Objectives Com. at May Meeting)			
66/18		A Resolution for a statement of Principle on Class Absences		Unan. passed (as amended)	By Stud.Rel.Com with Annual Rept.
66/19		Criteria for Promotion		Par.1 - one except. Par.2 -unan. as amended./with An.Rept.	By Fac.Per.Com.
66/20		Altering the University Cal- endar		Unan Passed	With spec rept of Admin.Mtrs.Com.
66/21	5/12/67	A Resolution to Enable Faculties to be Represented in the Univ. by members who serve primarily in a Teaching Capacity.		Tabled	Presented by SGBA to amend 66/8
66/22		A Resolution on Library Development		Passed	Presented by the Library Com. Attached to its Annual Report
66/23		A RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION TO PROFESSOR PARK PARLIAMENTARIAN			Unan Passed
66/24		A CITATION OF PROFESSOR CHARLES R. NAESER FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE			Unan Passed

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE
ON UNIVERSITY OBJECTIVES
1966-1967

The Committee on University Objectives was requested by the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the University Senate to study Technology and the Modern University, the report by the President's Advisory Committee on Engineering and Applied Science, dated November 1966. We have taken this assignment as our major project for the academic year 1966-67.

Although the report confines itself to SEAS, it has implications for and raises questions of concern to the University as a whole. We have therefore looked at it in the light of overall University objectives. We have met for a series of weekly discussions, organizing our talks around the Recommendations appearing on pages 4-7 of the report. We offer the following comments on that series of recommendations:

1. We agree that the University should assume an active and leading role in fostering education and research in science and technology, but we question whether the University should foster science and technology.

2. More precisely: 'Because of the importance of science and technology, the University should undertake to bring about the maximum feasible integration in all undergraduate, graduate, and research activities of all disciplines relevant to science and technology and their impact on society.' We concur in the recommendation as thus restated, and wish to add that responsibility should rest with the University administration to initiate and foster the process of integration.

3. We endorse this recommendation, but regret the inclusion of the third sentence.

4. We agree in general, but feel that one step is being left out: involvement of the non-administrative teaching staff of a department.

We recommend that the University administration establish some kind of top-level mechanism, with budget, to further the objective of interdepartmental and inter-school collaboration of educational programs. We do not know whether Vice-President Mayo's present organization is the appropriate mechanism for this purpose or not. However, in a meeting with our committee, Dr. Mayo said that he would like to be kept informed about all interdisciplinary research activities, in order that he might maintain (at the least) an information center on such matters. We recommend that the administration establish procedures by which he would be kept so informed; we leave open (as he leaves open for the present) the question whether he should or should not be involved in the action chain for such matters.

5. Correction of the syntax would clarify the meaning as follows: 'The research activities of the University involve numerous disciplines. Members of the several disciplines within the University should be encouraged by the administration to cultivate productive associations both among themselves and between their own group and other faculties of the University.' We concur.

6. Even after discussion at some length among ourselves, we consider that recommendation #6 remains unclear. We recommend that, as an effort toward clarification, formal discussions of this recommendation be continued among all appropriate persons in the University.

With respect to the two sentences in roman type,

we have grave reservations about an administratively separate University-wide

research institute, and one of our number has grave reservations about any kind of administratively separate research institute as a part of the structure of the total University. Also, we question whether the administrator proposed could be the coordinator for all interdisciplinary research activities throughout the University. (For example, should he have authority over such interdisciplinary work as the program in American Studies?)

See also our comments above, under #4.

7. This recommendation makes us uneasy in some ways. If any emphasis should be placed on programs for "continuing education," SEAS might endanger its central teaching and research activity. If this recommendation is accepted at all, the special arrangements should be subject to budgetary arrangements that do not detract from the central academic mission of SEAS.

8. We concur.

9. We should prefer to see the words in the latter part of the sentence in italics arranged in this order: ' . . . should be in graduate level education and in research.' However, recommendation #9 is meaningful with respect to graduate education only if there is a substantial full-time graduate student body.

With respect to the comment by Dr. Weinschel: We do not believe that serving local interests is basic, but we endorse the comment to the extent that Dr. Weinschel's proposal can be effected without detriment to the primary mission of the University.

In any event, we wish to express a cautionary word about the possible isolation of the graduate faculty from undergraduate instruction. We should deplore a development in that direction, partly because it would tend to weaken the graduate faculty itself (by blocking its members from the invaluable stimulation of contact with young minds at the earlier stages of their discipline), partly because it would tend to frustrate the move toward improving student quality (which will be notably enriched if the student body at the graduate level is supported and fed from a high quality in the undergraduate student body).

10. The intent of this recommendation seems to be to encourage selectivity. In general we support that as an objective, but we strongly urge that it should be the faculty who make the choices among the "few select fields."

Our understanding is that SEAS at present offers only the traditional parts of the engineering discipline (electrical, civil, and mechanical). Therefore, in terms of any non-traditional fields of engineering (which are essentially interdisciplinary areas, or areas involving a broad systems approach), recommendation #10 seems to be unrealistic in terms of the present capability. A very sizable expansion of SEAS would be required if #10 were to be realized.

The Vice President for Advanced Policy Studies, Dr. Mayo, has stated that, given our assumptions, our comment is correct in his judgment. However, he further suggests that a different approach might be employed to enlarge the area of research capability in the fields indicated under recommendation #10, and we are happy to forward his suggestions as a part of our report:

From time to time, one or more members of the SEAS Faculty might enter into an arrangement to associate with the Program of Policy Studies in Science and Technology or with one of the other policy study groups within the University. Under such an arrangement, the essential engineering and applied science skills could be so integrated with the skills of other relevant disciplines or professions as to produce a capability for analyzing public policy problems that arise in areas requiring a multi-disciplinary approach (urban planning, for example, and transportation). Dr. Mayo views this approach as one potentially profitable way for enlarging appreciably the present research capability of SEAS.

We concur.

11. We must offer a generally negative response to this recommendation. For, although we are in sympathy with the objective expressed, #11 appears inconsistent with recommendation #9. Also, to introduce courses for non-engineering students would inevitably strain the capacity of an engineering faculty already limited in number.

12-14: Although we cannot discuss details of the proposals for the Undergraduate Curriculum, it is our position that all undergraduate students in the University should be exposed to a curriculum that emphasizes the centrality of the liberal arts. Two years ago the Committee on University Objectives gave its enthusiastic endorsement to the principle enunciated in Basic Considerations Underlying an Academic Plan, about the centrality of the liberal arts. Our present membership includes several persons who belonged to the Committee in 1964-65, and all the members of the Committee for 1966-67 join in reaffirming the general principle, and in relating the principle to recommendations #12-14. We also join in expressing our emphatic disapprobation of the statement by Mr. Woodzel which appears at the top of page 6: "The humanities and social sciences are not essential to the first few years of the engineering graduate who is learning to apply his knowledge successfully."

Some of our number are impressed by the Minority Recommendations by Dr. Hollomon, Professor Naeser, and Dean Griffin (p.5), and express the hope that sympathetic consideration will be given to them by those who will ultimately make the decisions concerning the Undergraduate Curriculum.

15. Since we question our competence to speak here, we take no position with respect to this recommendation.

16. We began our discussion here with some measure of willingness to endorse #16 with the qualification that the program concerned eventuate in a baccalaureate degree. After discussion we concluded that such would probably not be the case, but that the program would eventuate in a technician's certificate. On that basis we emphatically disapprove recommendation #16.

17.)

18.) We concur, enthusiastically.

19.)

20. We invite attention to our comments above under #10, and we comment additionally as follows:

We express some skepticism about both the viability and the economic basis of the recommendation that "suitable people of national stature" be appointed. On the other hand, we endorse the objective of appointing persons "of potentially great promise in these fields" because we consider that most realistic.

21. We concur.

22. Determination of salary levels anywhere is a matter of the overall policy of the University. Recommendation #22 should be considered in the context of University-wide policy.

23. This recommendation, as stated, is improperly focused (a) in its reference to "all" faculty members, (b) in the exclusiveness of its reference to "joint appointments," and (c) in the fact that it is limited to SEAS. We propose the following as preferable: 'The University should develop procedures to encourage faculty members to engage in interdisciplinary academic programs.'

24. We like the Code and Ordinances as it now is, we affirm our belief that it should be applied without exception throughout the University, and we express our support of Resolution #66/14 unanimously adopted by the University Senate at its meeting on 10 March 1967.

25. Although we have no reason to believe that administrative practices are deficient, we endorse this recommendation.

However, we do not understand Dr. Weinschel's reference to operating profits. Indeed, we do not understand how operating profits could arise in the first place in an academic institution.

26.)

)

We endorse both recommendations.

27.)

28. We understand that SEAS is now organized with three departments, each with its own chairman. We endorse such an organizational pattern, and we prefer the term "chairman" to the term "head."

Otherwise, we consider recommendation #28 beyond our competence except for its last sentence, which should read as follows: 'The faculty should, without derogation of its responsibility and authority under the Faculty Code, exercise a responsible and meaningful advisory rôle.'

29-32: We endorse these recommendations in general, we recognize the need for new science and technology facilities as being among the major needs of the University, but we do not have sufficient information to express at this time any view with respect to priorities from the standpoint of the University as a whole.

33. We concur.

34. We invite attention to our comments above, on recommendations #9 and 29-32.

35. No comment is needed.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank D. Allan, Anatomy
Galip Arkilic, Engineering
Harold Green, Law
John Morgan, Political Science
Richard Stephens, Soc. & Anghro
Carl Stromsen, Public Admin.
John P. Reesing, Jr., English,
Chairman

INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

May 5, 1967

From: University Senate Committee on Administrative Matters as They
Affect the Faculty

To: The Faculty and Officers of the Administration

Subj: Altering the University Calendar

Encl: (1) Second special report on altering the University calendar
(2) Suggested University calendars, 1968-69 through 1972-73
(3) A Resolution to Alter the University Calendar

The University Senate Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty has recently studied proposals to modify the University calendar, placing the Fall semester between Labor Day and Christmas, advancing the Spring semester to end early in May, putting Commencement in mid-May, and leaving a somewhat longer and more flexible Summer period.

It appears to be barely possible to put an altered University calendar in effect for academic year 1968-69, provided the Faculty favors the proposal in principle and is willing to leave some of the details to the University Senate and to the Administration. Or the Faculty may prefer to delay or defeat the proposal as being defective in detail or unacceptable in principle.

The Chairman of the Executive Committee of the University Senate has called a special meeting of the Senate for 2:10 p.m. Friday, May 26, to debate the attached resolution which proposes modifying the University calendar, and the Executive Committee has approved sending this memorandum to the Faculty and officers of the Administration. The Administrative Matters Committee hopes that the faculties of the schools and colleges can meet to consider the calendar modification question both in principle and in detail as presented in the attached special report, so that the members of the Senate can be fully informed on the feasibility and desirability of calendar modification for the debate May 26.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY SENATE
COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS AS THEY AFFECT THE FACULTY

Second Special Report on Altering the University Calendar

The Administrative Matters Committee's first report on possible alterations to the University calendar, presented April 14, 1967, recommended that the Committee further consider the specific proposal to advance the Fall and Spring semesters, so that the Christmas recess separates them, and report again to the Senate. This second report contains the Committee's suggested calendars for 1968-69 through 1972-73, with the following observations:

1. Total teaching days, both by semester (left margin) and by days of the week (foot of each column), are indicated. The proposed calendars seem to vary no more than they do at present, including the examination periods as the final week of each semester. If this premise is wrong or unacceptable, the Fall semesters, especially 1970 and 1971, may be too short.
2. The Fall semesters are all short; therefore Veterans Day (November 11) is not indicated as a holiday, and even the Friday after Thanksgiving has been omitted as a holiday in 1970 because Labor Day falls at its latest (September 7) that year. The Committee felt that the easiest solution, which would be to put Fall examinations immediately after Christmas recess, was not worth overhauling the calendar for. Likewise the Committee decided against beginning the Fall semester before Labor Day.
3. The Spring semester has a one-week recess at mid-semester, approximately the first full week in March. Easter is never closer than two full weeks away from then. A four-day weekend has been assigned as Easter recess every year. No Spring reading period as such appears in the calendars; the Senate may wish to reconsider this by shortening the Summer period.
4. The Summer period is longer than at present--long enough to insert a third semester if some school wants to try it. The Committee's intent, however, is to promote adaptability and experimentation in Summer scheduling, not to impose round-the-year operation by any means.
5. Commencement in mid-May falls on Sundays except in 1971, when a Wednesday is suggested in order to minimize cyclical variation.

Although its members do not unanimously support every detail of the suggested calendars, the Committee concludes that the modified semester plan is workable in principle. The question remains whether the cost in detail, particularly the frantic Fall semester, is justified by the primary benefit of ending the Fall semester before Christmas, together with significant benefits in a more leisurely Spring semester and the opportunity for better use of the Summer period.

Respectfully submitted
for the Committee:

David J. Sharpe, Chairman

May 5, 1967

Suggested 1968-69 University Calendar--Senate Administrative Matters Committee

1968	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	
	<u>Sep</u> H-2	R-3	R-4	5	6	H: Labor Day: R: Register
	9	10	11	12	13	
FALL	16	17	18	19	20	
	23	24	25	26	27	
SEMESTER	30 <u>Oct</u> 1	2	3	4		
	7	8	9	10	11	
	14	15	16	17	18	
	21	22	23	24	25	
75	28	29	30	31 <u>Nov.</u>	1	
Teaching	4	5	6	7	8	
days	11	12	13	14	15	
	18	19	20	21	22	
	25	26	27	H-28	H-29	H: Thanksgiving Day
	<u>Dec</u> 2	3	4	5	6	
	9	10	11	12	13	
	16 (15)	17 (15)	18 (15)	19 (15)	20 (15)	
	23	24	H-25	26	27	H: Christmas Day
1969	30	31 Jan	H-1	2	3	H: New Year's Day
	R-6	R-7	8	9	10	
	13	14	15	16	17	
SPRING	H-20	21	22	23	24	H: Inauguration Day
	27	28	29	30	31	
SEMESTER	<u>Feb</u> 3	4	5	6	7	
	10	11	12	13	14	
	17	18	19	20	21	Sat 22: G.W.'s B'day
	24	25	26	27	28	
75	<u>Mar</u> H-3	H-4	H-5	H-6	H-7	H: Spring Recess
Teaching	10	11	12	13	14	
days	17	18	19	20	21	
	24	25	26	27	28	
	31 <u>Apr</u>	1	2	3	H-4	Sun 6: Easter
	H-7	8	9	10	11	
	14	15	16	17	18	
	21	22	23	24	25	
	28 (13)	29 (15)	30 (16)	May 1 (16)	2 (15)	
	5	6	7	8	9	Sun 11: Commencement
	12	13	14	15	16	
	19	20	21	22	23	
	26	27	28	29	H-30	H: Memorial Day
	<u>Jun</u> 2	3	4	5	6	
	9	10	11	12	13	
	16	17	18	19	20	
	23	24	25	26	27	
	30 <u>Jul</u>	1	2	3	H-4	H: Independence Day
	7	8	9	10	11	
	14	15	16	17	18	
	21	22	23	24	25	
	28	29	30	31 <u>Aug</u>	1	
	4	5	6	7	8	
	11	12	13	14	15	
	18	19	20	21	22	
	25	26	27	28	29	
	<u>Sep</u> H-1	R-2	R-3	4	5	H: Labor Day

Suggested 1969-1970 University Calendar--Senate Administrative Matters Committee

1969	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	
	<u>Sep</u> H-1	R-2	R-3	4	5	H: Labor Day
	8	9	10	11	12	
FALL	15	16	17	18	19	
	22	23	24	25	26	
SEMESTER	29	30	<u>Oct.</u> 1	2	3	
	6	7	8	9	10	
	13	14	15	16	17	
	20	21	22	23	24	
75	27	28	29	30	31	
teaching	Nov 3	4	5	6	7	
days	10	11	12	13	14	
	17	18	19	20	21	
	24	25	26	H-27	H-28	H:Thanksgiving Day
	<u>Dec.</u> 1	2	3	4	5	
	8	9	10	11	12	
	15(15)	16(15)	17(15)	18(15)	19(15)	
	22	23	24	H-25	26	H: Christmas Day
	29	30	31	Jan. H-1	2	H:New Year's Day
1970	R-5	R-6	7	8	9	
	12	13	14	15	16	
	19	20	21	22	23	
SPRING	26	27	28	29	30	
	<u>Feb.</u> 2	3	4	5	6	
SEMESTER	9	10	11	12	13	
	16	17	18	19	20	
	H-23	24	25	26	27	Sun 22:G.W.B'day
	<u>Mar</u> H-2	H-3	H-4	H-5	H-6	H: Spring Recess
75	9	10	11	12	13	
Teaching	16	17	18	19	20	
days	23	24	25	26	H-27	Sun 29: Easter
	H-30	31	<u>Apr.</u> 1	2	3	
	6	7	8	9	10	
	13	14	15	16	17	
	20	21	22	23	24	
	27(13)	28(15)	29(16)	30(16)May	1(15)	
	4	5	6	7	8	(Sun 10:Commencemt)
	11	12	13	14	15	
	18	19	20	21	22	
	25	26	27	28	29	Sat 30:Memorial Day
	<u>Jun.</u> 1	2	3	4	5	
	8	9	10	11	12	
	15	16	17	18	19	
	22	23	24	25	26	
	29	30	<u>Jul.</u> 1	2	3	Sat 4: IndependenceDay
	6	7	8	9	10	
	13	14	15	16	17	
	20	21	22	23	24	
	27	28	29	30	31	
	<u>Aug.</u> 3	4	5	6	7	
	10	11	12	13	14	
	17	18	19	20	21	
	24	25	26	27	28	
	31	Sep. 1	2	3	4	
	H-7	R-8	R-9	10	11	H: Labor Day

Suggested 1970-71 University Calendar--Senate Administrative Matters Committee

1970	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	
	<u>Sep.</u> H-7	R-8	R-9	10	11	H: Labor Day
	14	15	16	17	18	
FALL	21	22	23	24	25	
	28	29	30	<u>Oct.</u> 1	2	
SEMESTER	5	6	7	8	9	
	12	13	14	15	16	
	19	20	21	22	23	
	26	27	28	29	30	
73	<u>Nov.</u> 2	3	4	5	6	
teaching	9	10	11	12	13	
days	16	17	18	19	20	
	23	24	25	H-26	27	H: Thanksgiving Day
	30	<u>Dec.</u> 1	2	3	4	
	7	8	9	10	11	
	14	15	16(14)	17(14)	18(15)	
	21(15)	22(15)	23	24	H-25	H: Christmas Day
	28	29	30	31	<u>Jan.</u> H-1	H: New Year's Day
1971	4	5	6	R-7	R-8	
	11	12	13	14	15	
	18	19	20	21	22	
SPRING	25	26	27	28	29	
SEMESTER	<u>Feb.</u> 1	2	3	4	5	
	8	9	10	11	12	
	15	16	17	18	19	
74	H-22	23	24	25	26	H: G.W.'s B'day
Teaching	<u>Mar.</u> H-1	H-2	H-3	H-4	H-5	H: Spring Recess
days	8	9	10	11	12	
	15	16	17	18	19	
	22	23	24	25	26	
	29	30	31	<u>Apr.</u> 1	2	
	5	6	7	8	H-9	Sun 11: Easter
	H-12	13	14	15	16	
	19	20	21	22	23	
	26	27	28(15)	29(15)	30(14)	
	<u>May</u> 3(14)	4(16)	5	6	7	
	10	11	12	13	14	Wed 12: Commencement
	17	18	19	20	21	
	24	25	26	27	28	
	H-31	<u>Jun.</u> 1	2	3	4	H: Sun 30 Memorial Day
	7	8	9	10	11	
	14	15	16	17	18	
	21	22	23	24	25	
	28	29	30	<u>Jul.</u> 1	2	
	H-5	6	7	8	9	H: Sun 4 Independence Day
	12	13	14	15	16	
	19	20	21	22	23	
	26	27	28	29	30	
	<u>Aug.</u> 2	3	4	5	6	
	9	10	11	12	13	
	16	17	18	19	20	
	23	24	25	26	27	
	30	31	<u>Sep.</u> 1	2	3	
	H-6	R-7	R-8	9	10	H: Labor Day

Suggested 1971-72 University Calendar: Senate Administrative Matters Committee

1971	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	
	<u>Sep.</u> H-6	R-7	R-8	9	10	H: Labor Day
	13	14	15	16	17	
FALL	20	21	22	23	24	
	27	28	29	30	<u>Oct.</u> 1	
SEMESTER	4	5	6	7	8	
	11	12	13	14	15	
	18	19	20	21	22	
	25	26	27	28	29	
73	<u>Nov.</u> 1	2	3	4	5	
teaching	8	9	10	11	12	
days	15	16	17	18	19	
	22	23	24	H-25	H-26	H: Thanksgiving Day
	29	30	<u>Dec.</u> 1	2	3	
	6	7	8	9	10	
	13	14	15	16 (14)	17 (14)	
	20 (15)	21 (15)	22 (15)	23	24	Sat 25: Christmas Day
	27	28	29	30	31	Sat Jan 1: New Year's
1972	<u>Jan.</u> 3	4	5	6	7	
	R-10	R-11	12	13	14	
	17	18	19	20	21	
SPRING	24	25	26	27	28	
	31	<u>Feb.</u> 1	2	3	4	
SEMESTER	7	8	9	10	11	
	14	15	16	17	18	
	21	H-22	23	24	25	H: G W's Birthday
	28	29	<u>Mar.</u> 1	2	3	
75	H-6	H-7	H-8	H-9	H-10	H: Spring Recess
teaching	13	14	15	16	17	
	20	21	22	23	24	
	27	28	29	30	H-31	Sun. 2: Easter
	<u>Apr.</u> H-3	4	5	6	7	
	10	11	12	13	14	
	17	18	19	20	21	
	24	25	26	27	28	
	<u>May</u> 1 (14)	2 (14)	3 (16)	4 (16)	5 (15)	
	8	9	10	11	12	Sun 14: Commencement
	15	16	17	18	19	
	22	23	24	25	26	
	29	H-30	31	<u>Jun</u> 1	2	H: Memorial Day
	5	6	7	8	9	
	12	13	14	15	16	
	19	20	21	22	23	
	26	27	28	29	30	
	<u>Jul</u> 3	H-4	5	6	7	H: Independence Day
	10	11	12	13	14	
	17	18	19	20	21	
	24	25	26	27	28	
	31	<u>Aug.</u> 1	2	3	4	
	7	8	9	10	11	
	14	15	16	17	18	
	21	22	23	24	25	
	28	29	30	31	<u>Sep.</u> 1	
	H-4	R-5	R-6	7	8	H: Labor Day

Suggested 1972-73 University Calendar--Senate Administrative Matters Committee

1972	MON	TUE	WED	THU	FRI	
	<u>Sep</u> H-4	R-5	R-6	7	8	H: Labor Day
	11	12	13	14	15	
FALL	18	19	20	21	22	
	25	26	27	28	29	
SEMESTER	Oct. 2	3	4	5	6	
	9	10	11	12	13	
	16	17	18	19	20	
	23	24	25	26	27	
74	30	31 <u>Nov.</u>	1	2	3	
teaching	6	7	8	9	10	
days	13	14	15	16	17	
	20	21	22	H-23	H-24	H: Thanksgiving Day
	27	28	29	30	<u>Dec.</u> 1	
	4	5	6	7	8	
	11	12	13	14	15 (14)	
	18(15)	19(15)	20(15)	21(15)	22	
	H-25	26	27	28	29	H: Christmas Day
1973	Jan. H-1	2	3	4	5	H: New Year's Day
	R-8	R-9	10	11	12	
	15	16	17	18	19	Sat 20: Inauguration
SPRING	22	23	24	25	26	
SEMESTER	29	30	31 <u>Feb.</u>	1	2	
	5	6	7	8	9	
	12	13	14	15	16	
	19	20	21	H-22	23	H: G. W.'s Birthday
75	26	27	28 <u>Mar.</u>	1	2	
teaching	H-5	H-6	H-7	H-8	H-9	H: Spring Recess
days	12	13	14	15	16	
	19	20	21	22	23	
	26	27	28	29	30	
	<u>Apr.</u> 2	3	4	5	6	
	9	10	11	12	13	
	16	17	18	19	H-20	Sun 22: Easter
	H-23	24	25	26	27	
	30(14)	May 1(15)	2(16)	3(15)	4(15)	
	7	8	9	10	11	Sun 13: Commencement
	14	15	16	17	18	
	21	22	23	24	25	
	28	29	H-30	31	<u>Jun</u> 1	H: Memorial Day
	4	5	6	7	8	
	11	12	13	14	15	
	18	19	20	21	22	
	25	26	27	28	29	
	<u>Jul.</u> 2	3	H-4	5	6	H: Independence Day
	9	10	11	12	13	
	16	17	18	19	20	
	23	24	25	26	27	
	30	31 <u>Aug.</u>	1	2	3	
	6	7	8	9	10	
	13	14	15	16	17	
	20	21	22	23	24	
	27	28	29	30	31	
	(Sep H-3	R-4	R-5	6	7	H: Labor Day

A RESOLUTION TO ALTER THE UNIVERSITY
CALENDAR

Be It Resolved by the University Senate of The George Washington University:

1. The University Senate recommends the adoption of a University calendar constructed upon the following principles:

- (a) The Fall semester shall lie between Labor Day and Christmas Day.
- (b) Thanksgiving shall normally be observed as a holiday weekend.
- (c) The Spring semester shall commence early in January and end early in May.
- (d) A one-week Spring recess shall be located in the first week of March, and Easter shall normally be observed as a holiday weekend.
- (e) Commencement shall take place near the middle of May.
- (f) Each semester shall contain approximately 75 class days, including examinations, and each day of the week should receive approximately the same number of class days.

2. The Senate regards as an administrative function the assignment of dates to the University calendar, within the principles set forth, including the observance of national holidays and the placement of University holidays.

Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty
Special Meeting Friday, May 26, 1967

SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT 1966-67

1. The Committee met on the following dates during the year:

July 7, 1966
July 12, 1966
January 25, 1967
February 21, 1967
April 26, 1967

2. The meetings in July 1966 were called at the request of President Elliott to interview candidates for the position of University Librarian. On July 8, the committee was granted an interview with President Elliott, the purpose being to be informed of the administration's long-range plans for the librarianship and for library improvement and expansion.
3. The committee has acted or studied possible courses of action in several domains:
 - a. Implicit in all exchange of ideas during the year was the basic question of the real function, as opposed to the administrative existence, of a senate library committee. Although our collective attitude toward this concept remained open, an opinion gradually took form during the year that as a committee of the senate, we should act as a liaison between the library staff and the academic faculty. The main business of the committee is conceived to be the formulation and expression of faculty opinions and attitudes toward matters of general library policy and toward questions bearing on the library's future development and use. The committee's deliberations and conclusions in this area will be given in following paragraphs.
 - b. The committee, as stated above, was consulted in the later stages of the selection of a new librarian. It interviewed two candidates, and made its recommendation to the President, unanimously supporting the candidacy of Rupert C. Woodward, subsequently appointed to the post.
 - c. The constitution of the committee and committee procedures were taken up at the announced meetings in 1967 and the following conclusions or determinations were reached:
 - 1) At Senate Library Committee meetings Mr. Woodward, member ex officio, would be accompanied by (Mrs.) Alice Sheftel (who served on the committee pending Mr. Woodward's arrival in January, and who had just been appointed Assistant Director of Libraries in Charge of Operations) in an informal ex officio capacity.
 - 2) Mr. Woodward, announcing the formation of a Library Council composed of the Director, the Librarians of Law and Medicine, and heads of University Library Departments, proposed that the committee receive the announcements and minutes of Council meetings. The Committee accepted the proposal with appreciation, and since has found the communication thus established extremely useful.
 - 3) A member representing the Medical Library should be added to the committee. Mary Louise Robbins was nominated and duly elected by the Senate.

- d. Mr. Woodward was invited as a matter of ordinary procedure to present to the committee brief reports on all matters relating to library policies and operations and to solicit committee opinion thereon as representative of a more general faculty attitude. Opinions and conclusions of the committee are understood as being entirely tentative, the committee acting here simply as a source of information. If the subject taken up is related to general policy or for other reasons clearly within the competence of the senate, it was and is always to be referred for special study. Some of the topics discussed but not acted upon by the committee are:
- 1) Library use regulations.
 - 2) A gift-acceptance policy.
 - 3) The disposition of the "third" bound copy of theses and dissertations (now held by the Library).
 - 4) The advantages and disadvantages of establishing branch libraries of collections used almost exclusively by the staff and research students in certain fields, such as the physical sciences.
In the extensive discussions on this point it became apparent that, if the membership of the committee can be taken as representative of general faculty opinion, the principal opposition to the policy arises from the expense and other practical difficulties it would create for the library staff. The present library budget renders such divisions impossible at present. The value of such collections being housed where they can be consulted without loss of time being undeniable, the committee set the topic aside for further consideration when action upon it becomes feasible.
 - 5) The Committee has discussed the open-stack policy often proposed by faculty and student body alike. There being no significant opposition (the committee members were asked to poll their colleagues informally and a strong majority of the academic faculty is in favor of the plan), Mr. Woodward has announced that the policy will go into effect as soon as the necessary changes in the library building can be made.
- e. The topic of greatest immediate importance to the University is the most rapid possible development of the University Library. It is recognized that a new library building and improvement of library collections is one of the first items in plans for university development publicly announced by President Elliott. It is also recognized that Mr. Woodward has without delay established procedures and policies that will lead to as much improvement as can be expected within the restrictions of the current budget.
1. One course of action proposed bilaterally by the librarian and by the committee is the establishment of a Library Acquisitions Committee composed of the head of the acquisitions department of the library and of members from each department of the University, in such numbers as each department considers necessary. Most, if not all, departments have long delegated such responsibilities to one or more of their members. The committee believes that the constitution of a committee made up of such experienced members will give the advantage of interdepartmental communication on collections of primary interest to more than one department and will allow for tighter liaison of the faculty and the library staff. The first business of this committee shall be to survey and evaluate the present library holdings and establish priorities for the immediate acquisition of the most necessary books and other

materials so that the faculty and student body be freed from dependence on the Congressional or other libraries in the area as soon as possible.

2. Furthermore, the committee believes that it is representing a general faculty opinion in concluding that, in view of the extent and seriousness of library problems, the current budget for acquisitions, although a welcome increase over that of preceding years, remains quite inadequate. The current plan of a fixed increase of library purchasing power in the amount of \$100,000 per annum is not only insufficient in itself, but if stronger support is not given immediately, the library will fall behind rather than advance. The committee most urgently suggests that the plan be revised so that within three to five years the library's total budget be raised to meet the minimum standard set by the American Library Association, to wit, five per cent of the annual educational budget; and that it be increased each year thereafter to keep pace with that budget.
3. In view of the foregoing, the committee proposes to the Senate the attached resolution, urging the administration to give first priority to an immediate and dramatic increase of the library's current purchasing power.

Submitted by the Library Committee

Bernard, Jr., Hugh Y.
Clubb, William G., Chairman
Coberly, James H.
Hugh, Rudolph
Leite, Laurence P.
Levy, Bernard
Robbins, Mary Louise
Woodward, Rupert C., Librarian
Wrenn, Samuel N.

Proposed Resolution on Library Development by the Library Committee

66/22

Whereas, the library holds a central place in the life of the University, and

Whereas, this University's growth is necessarily dependent on the improvement and continuing increase of library holdings, and

Whereas, a severely limited and limiting budget has led in the past to virtual stagnation of the general collections, and

Whereas, the current budget is inadequate to allow for necessary growth,

Be it then Resolved that the University Senate endorse the establishment of a faculty library acquisitions committee whose purpose shall be to survey and make known to the Librarian and to the administration areas where great and immediate additions to the collection are most needed, and

Be it further Resolved that the Senate urge and request that the Administration adopt a policy of fiscal support of the library such that (within a minimum of three to five years) the library budget will reach and thereafter remain at five per cent of the University educational budget.

ANNUAL REPORT, 1966-1967
SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

The Committee on Research encountered three major problems during the year.

The first question raised in committee session concerned the need and purpose for this committee. Difficulty was encountered in deciding with what questions we might concern ourselves during the year. It was clear that the immediate problem areas such as facilities, funds, and personnel were already the active concern of the University Research Committee or one or the other school committees on research. Further, these problem areas had already been studied and reported upon adequately by previous Senate research committees. Simply restudying and restating these problems hardly seemed worthwhile. The chairman was instructed by the Committee to seek direction in this matter from the Coordinating Committee. This was done, with the following result. The Committee on Research was informed that possibly one impediment to further research development at G.W.U. was the formidable administrative machinery which had to be moved before application for, funding, and fiscal administration of research grants could be accomplished.

In order to test this question, various randomly selected faculty members were asked to give their opinions as to why research at this University was lagging behind other areas of development. The following generalized opinions were offered:

1. The current administrative process frequently seems to prolong the time when the investigator begins the application on its route through the administration and the time that the granting institution finally receives the application. In some cases this seems to have resulted in missed deadlines and consequently delayed funding.
2. In at least one case the "cost-sharing" agreement became lost within the administrative area, and the resulting delay in filing actually cost the University several thousand dollars in N.I.H. funds and delayed the investigator for slightly in excess of two months. Repeated calls to the Business Office by both the investigator and N.I.H. did not seem to result in any action.
3. Burdensome administrative duties in connection with the grant administration, coupled with seemingly ever-changing "ground rules," administrative forms and protocols, etc., serve to keep the investigators "desk-bound" when they should be at the bench, producing results.

The Committee, being comprised of active researchers, both understands and appreciates these "facts of grant life." These are problems which impede research; but where to begin in the evaluation of this truly intricate, multi-faceted question is another problem. Indeed, the question might well be asked whether this is solely a University generated situation or not.

The Research Committee does not feel that it has either the authority or ability to perform an administrative review of this nature, but does feel that it is within our charge to point out that the entire grants administrative process does discourage some of the less hardy faculty from venturing into sponsored research.

Respectfully submitted,

A. H. Desmond	- Zoology
N. Filipescu	- Chemistry
I. Telford	- Anatomy
H. Hobbs	- Physics
G. Arkilic	- Engineering
R. H. Walker	- American Civilization
G. A. Olkhovsky	- Russian
J.W. Hillis	- Speech
R. D. Walk	- Psychology
R. C. Parlett,	- Microbiology,
Chairman	

Ex Officio

Harold Bright
Arthur Burns
L. H. Mayo